



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,669	10/13/2006	Tae Young Won	SAMHP002	7232
25920	7590	02/11/2008		EXAMINER
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP			MEROUAN, ABDERRAHIM	
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 200				4192
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085				
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/11/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/552,669	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 4192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Specification***

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it should be in a separate page. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,4, 5, 7, and 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Kim. (U.S. PGPUB 20020070932) hereinafter Kim.

As per claim 1 Kim teaches:

A method for displaying panel image simulation result, which exhibits the electro optical characteristics of a liquid crystal display (LCD) panel as a function of a viewing angle of an observer who views the LCD panel, the method comprising the steps of:

- a) converting the observer's viewing angle into a coordinate information; (Kim, Paragraph [0047], lines 4 to 6)
- b) performing a viewing transformation which converts a coordinate information in a world coordinate system into a coordinate information in an eye coordinate system on the basis of direction information of the observer's viewing angle; (Kim, Paragraph [0051], lines 5 to 10)
- c) reading out estimated image date from the memory to out of the viewing transformation results; (Kim, Paragraph [0018], lines 2 to 5)
- d) projecting a three-dimensional coordinate image for use in the eye coordinate system having been read at the step (c) on a projection plane perpendicular to the

Art Unit: 4192

converted viewing angle, and mapping the projected result to a two-dimensional coordinate; and (Kim, Paragraph [0051], lines 5 to 12)

e) displaying the mapping result image. (Kim, Paragraph [0041], lines 9 to 11)

3. As per claim 4 Kim teaches: The method as set forth in Claim 1, claim 4 adds into claim 1:

Wherein the step (b) includes the step of: using functions contained in a graphics library such as OpenGL or MESA. (Kim, Paragraph [0014], lines 1 to 15)

4. Arguments used to reject 5 and 8 are analogous to argument used to reject claim 4

5. As per claim 7 Kim teaches: The method as set forth in Claim 1, claim 7 adds into claim 1:

Wherein the step (e) includes the step of: further including either one of original image information and viewing angle information or their combination, and displaying the mapping result image. (Kim, Paragraph [0014], lines 6 to 11)

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. PGPUB 20020070932) hereinafter Kim. as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Lipton et al ( U.S. Patent 6366281 B1) , hereinafter Lipton.

8. As per claim 2 Kim teaches: The method as set forth in Claim 1.

Kim doesn't teach: receiving view point information of the observer when the observer clicks on a position of a view point using a mouse.

Lipton teaches: receiving view point information of the observer when the observer clicks on a position of a view point using a mouse. (Lipton, Column 7, lines 35 to 38)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lipton into Kim since Kim did not suggest receiving view point information of the observer when the observer clicks on a position of a view point using a mouse, and Lipton suggests the beneficial use of the mouse such as for easy and precise selecting the view point information

9. As per claim 3 Kim teaches: The method as set forth in Claim 1

Kim doesn't teach: wherein the step (a) includes the step of: correcting a position of a view point using a mouse-dragging operation or arrow keys of a keyboard, and receiving coordinate information of the view point.

Lipton teaches: wherein the step (a) includes the step of: correcting a position of a view point using a mouse-dragging operation or arrow keys of a keyboard, and receiving coordinate information of the view point. (Lipton, Column 7, lines 51 to 54)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lipton into Kim since Kim did not suggest: correcting a position of a view point using a mouse-dragging operation or arrow keys of a keyboard, and receiving coordinate information of the view point, and Lipton suggests the beneficial use of the mouse-dragging operation such as for a precise repositioning.

10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. PGPUB 20020070932) hereinafter Kim. as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Suits et al ( U.S. Patent 6525731 B1) , hereinafter Suits.

11. As per claim 6 Kim teaches: The method as set forth in Claim 1

Kim doesn't teach: wherein the step (e) includes the step of: displaying a mapping result image on one or more divided projection planes.

Suits teaches: wherein the step (e) includes the step of: displaying a mapping result image on one or more divided projection planes. (Suits, Column 10, lines 6 to 17)

Art Unit: 4192

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Suits into Kim since Kim did not suggest: displaying a mapping result image on one or more divided projection planes, and Suits suggests the beneficial use of displaying a mapping result image on one or more divided projection planes such as viewing images from different angle at the same time

### ***Conclusion***

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pankaj Kumar can be reached on (571) 272-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Abderrahim Merouan  
Examiner  
Art Unit 4192

/Pankaj Kumar/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4192